

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed July 24, 2007. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 and 11-14 are pending in the application with claim 1 being in independent form. Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 8.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,049,316 issued to Nolan et al. The Examiner has further maintained the rejection of claims 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Nolan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,614 issued to Mitchell et al. The Examiner has further maintained the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Nolan et al. in view of Mitchell et al. and further in view of Japanese Publication No. 2001-356752 issued to Tomohiro et al. The Examiner has further maintained the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Nolan et al. in view of Japanese Publication No. 2000-352962 issued to Jun et al. The Examiner has further maintained the rejection of claim 14 over Nolan et al. in view of Mitchell et al. and Tomohiro et al. and further in view of Jun et al.

Specifically, the Examiner has alleged “it is noted that applicants in their remarks have not argued the differences and/or distinctions between the applied art and the claimed inventions” and “thus the undersigned examiner has not provided a rebuttal response since there is no arguments”. (See: page 4, section 8 of the Office Action). In this regard, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner’s attention to Applicants’ response dated March 13, 2007, in response to the Office Action mailed December 13, 2006, in which Applicants have amended claim 1 and presented the patentable distinctions between the claimed invention and Nolan et al. In order to

amend a grammatical error, Applicants has further submitted a supplementary response dated April 20, 2007, in which the previous amendments and arguments were not reiterated to avoid redundancy.

However, in order to be fully responsive to the most recent Office Action mailed July 24, 2007, Applicants would like to restate the following arguments.

Claim 1 recites: "...a data sending and receiving device which sends and receives device information to and from image display devices connected in series to said input interface and said output interface, said image display devices being driven simultaneously...said identification processing device reads specification information from image display devices connected to an output interface by using said data sending and receiving device, extracts data common to its own specification data to edit its own specification data, and stores the edited specification data in said storage device." The features recited in claim 1 are fully supported throughout the specification and recited in claims 9 and 10 as originally filed.

Nolan et al. discloses a PC laptop with multiple refresh-rate configurations using active and default registers to set the refresh rate of a monitor that is intermittently connected to the PC laptop. Nolan et al. does not teach driving multiple monitors simultaneously, nor does Nolan et al. disclose allocating device addresses.

Based on Nolan et al., the disclosed laptop appears to be configured to use a CRT screen when at work or home and the built-in LCD screen when traveling. There is no indication that the laptop is configured to use both the LCD and the CRT at the same time. Rather, Nolan et al. clearly contemplates switching between the two display devices instead of driving both simultaneously. (See: FIG. 11). Therefore, multiple image display devices are not driven simultaneously, as is recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Also, Nolan et al. does not provide any teaching regarding the multiple display devices being connected in series. In fact, with reference to FIG. 6 of Nolan et al., the CRT is connected to digital-to-analog converter (DAC 58) while the LCD is connected to an LCD controller (LCD CTLR 62) thus the two display devices are not connected in series.

Therefore, Nolan et al. fails to teach driving image display devices simultaneously, allocating device addresses to the image display devices, and multiple display devices connected in series, as recited in claims 1, 2 and 11.

Since Nolan et al. fails to disclose each and every element recited in claims 1, 2 and 11, the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Nolan et al. is overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Since Mitchell et al., Tomohiro et al. and Jun et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose or suggest the limitations recited in independent claim 1, from which claims 3-8 and 11-14 depend, claims 3-8 and 12-14 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons provided above.

Further, with respect to claims 13 and 14, none of the cited references disclose any of the limitations recited in these claims. Specifically, claims 13 and 14 recite: "...a response device which processes index control responses in a multiple monitor environment using indexes, even when it is not physically connected to a host computer." Neither Jun et al., Mitchell et al. nor Tomohiro et al. disclose any such response device. The cited references disclose or suggest that the display device is connected to a host computer in order to provide functionality.

Since the limitations recited in claims 13 and 14 are not disclosed by the cited prior art references, claims 13 and 14 are believed to be allowable on their own.

Therefore, the rejections of claims 3-8 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the various combinations of Nolan et al., Mitchell et al., Tomohiro et al. and Jun et al are overcome and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, claims 1-8 and 11-14 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

Further, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the finality of the Office Action mailed July 24, 2007, and reconsider the pending claims of the application in light of the arguments presented herein. Specifically, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to particularly point out where in the Nolan et al. reference the asserted limitations of claims 1, 2 and 3 are disclosed.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.

Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:HC:me